

Volume III.

Number 1.

EDINBURGH, Sept. 7, 1867.
GREYFRIAR'S CHURCHYARD.

"Remember, man, as thou goest by,
As thou art now, so once was I,
As I am now, so shalt thou be;
Remember, man, that thou must die."

*Pronounced dee.

For the Free Christian Commonwealth.
(Edification, not Destruction.)

Love to God in Christ, and to man for Christ's sake, is never attained in any school of human philosophy. Paul denounces this *conceit* of worldly wisdom with the gravest satire, and keen irony, as well as solemn warning, as contrasted with the *partly* revealed wisdom of God, in the mystery of the gospel. "We (the Apostles) are fools for Christ's sake and yours." Thus he insinuates, you "are fools naturally, for your own sakes," and if you would be wise, become a fool just like us, *babes in Christ*; for *'si feceris, sicut nos, eris sicut nos.'*" That is throw away your foolish cap of philosophy, and God will give you a crown of glory! Ho! you

The Appraiser of the South to its Educated Men. By REV. T. D. WITHERSPOUN, of Memphis Tennessee.

Who would ask a grander or more inspiring field of literary labor? To trace the causes, proximate and remote, which led a people, once so devoted to the union of these States, to desire a seve-

With the educated men of the South at the present day rests the question in what light history shall consider those who fought and fell in the armies of the South; whether as true men, fighting for principle, under the inspiration of the highest and most sacred motives that can appeal to the Christian and to the patriot, or as mere political agitators and revolutionists, wearied with the restraints of settled government, urged on by no higher motive than the desire of change and the ambition of being the founders of a new government. There is a determined effort being made to write the history of this revolution as a factious and causeless conspiracy against peaceful government, and the men engaged in it as lawless disintegrators, corrupt demagogues and profligate traitors. Treason, odious as that word is, is now charged not only upon the greatest of our living heroes, but upon the purest of our dead. Men of the South! shall that word *traitor*, so loathsome to every ingenious mind, be fixed as the stigma upon our gallant dead, and shall none be found to vindicate them from the charge? As I stand within the walls of this State University to-day, and look around me into the faces of the Mississippians gathered here; and then, as there rise grandly before me in memory the forms of Barksdale and Mott, of Benton and Van Dorn, of Statham and Autrey, of Liddell and Green, of Miller and Glenn, of Feeney and Evans, and a host of other noble men who fell in the service of your State, the question arises: "Shall the names of these men go down to history as traitors—as lawless, unprincipled revolutionists?" And I read in the responsive flash of every eye before me these words: "By all that is ingenious and

What are the circumstances? He is put on trial the same day before two different tribunals; one the highest ecclesiastical court, the other the highest civil court of the nation. He is tried on two altogether distinct and different charges—before the Church court on the charge of blasphemy, in saying he is the Son of God, which would have been no crime in the eye of the civil court at all; and before the civil court on the charge of rebellion and treasonable designs against the civil government—a charge which, before the Church court, would have been held no crime at all, but rather a merit. The Church court has the will but not the power to punish him capitally, or by anything beyond scourging; the civil court has the power but not the will to punish him at all, believing him to be the victim of a bloodthirsty junta, hypocritically veiling its jealous hate under the guise of zeal for religion. In this clash of wills, the Church court seeks to gain its end by hypocritically accommodating its charge to the jurisdiction of the civil court, and at the same time appealing to its fears; and therefore accuses the prisoner of treason, in seditiously claiming to be a king, and to absolve the people from their allegiance, as expressed by their

1. That Jesus here affirms himself, in accordance with all preeding and all succeeding revelations from God, not only a teacher of truth, but the founder and perpetual head of a *society* or community, to which his followers belong. His gospel is not simply certain truths to be embraced individually, and thereby to bring those who receive them into an association of sympathy, as some society of men adopting the same truths of science; but a combination of men organically, as in a State—members of one spiritual community, and brethren of one holy family.

2. And from this inference follows necessarily another, growing out of the very conception of a community, viz: that this kingdom or community, like every community, implies—first, *Officers*

It is then of *Illis* visible Church as a community and a governmental power of which Jesus affirms this fundamental contrast with the kingdoms of this world. And we are therefore authorized to expound this summary declaration concerning it in the light of all that is said in detail concerning it throughout the entire book.

What then, in detail, are the points of distinction involved in this summary contrast by Jesus of *Illis* Church or kingdom, as a government organized and the kingdoms of this world, the State? The simple enumeration of them will show that though both are of Divine institution, and exercise their authority over the same subjects—the families of the earth—and have the same end—the glory of God, yet they move in spheres

[Continued on fourth page.]

Free Christian Commonwealth

LOUISVILLE, KY., THURSDAY, OCTOBER 3, 1867.

REV. STUART ROBINSON, Editor.
REV. GEO. O. BARNES, Cor. Editor.
DAVIDSON & ROBINSON, Publishers.

John Stuart Mill and Henry Ward Beecher on the Right and Duty of Woman to Vote—Political Atheism.

Some one sends us two tracts, issued by the "American Equal Rights Association," one entitled, "A Plea for Woman," speech by John Stuart Mill, May 20th, 1867; the other, "Woman's Duty to Vote," speeches by Henry Ward Beecher before the Women's Rights Convention, May 10th, 1866, and May 10th, 1867. It is hardly to be presumed that they were sent with the expectation either of receiving friendly notice or of provoking grave discussion. For it can hardly be supposed that we are not aware of the theory and policy of such men and women as constitute this "Equal Rights Association," that any sort of mad fanaticism has won more than half its way to dominion over the excitement-loving, nervous, and brainless "New England mind" of a certain stamp—whether found in New England or elsewhere, when once it can get sober men entangled into the discussion of absurd and preposterous propositions. Since to entertain such questions as they are continually raising, simply to keep public opinion from settling down into the belief of anything as certain, is a tacit admission that their absurd proposition has color of truth and reason enough about it to entitle it at least to consideration.

But as significant of tendencies in the spirit of the times, and as a moral phenomenon simply, the fact that such men make such speeches, and that associations exist for the circulation of such sentiments, may well awaken serious inquiry among all that class of our people who are not yet wholly given over to the "strong delusion that believes the lie"—political, social, and religious—which now rules the hour.

And what, with us, adds greatly to the significance of the phenomenon is the circumstance of receiving at the same time, on the same subject, from the same Association, utterances to the same effect from two men, not only of different nationalities and different forms of government, but of utterly different genius and taste, and, apparently, of utterly different views of religion. Mr. John Stuart Mill is, of all the men of his age, a metaphysical thinking-machine; Mr. Beecher, without a single element of the metaphysician or the thinker about him, simply a brilliant rhetorical talker. Mr. John Stuart Mill is, professedly, a thoroughgoing Rationalist, of the lowest atheistic order; Mr. Beecher, professedly, not only a Christian believer, but a public teacher of the Christian religion, of the Puritanic evangelical order. Mr. Mill is the representative of the "advanced thought" of a powerful Jacobinical party, under a monarchy, which is gradually but surely undermining the whole political structure; Mr. Beecher, the representative of the "advanced thought" of a powerful religious party in a Democratic Republic, with ramifications extending into all Protestant churches, more or less, and rapidly but surely undermining all constitutions, ecclesiastical and civil alike. Mr. John Stuart Mill is a man who, judging from the intensity of his hatred to the truth that "the Lord God omnipotent reigneth," must evidently have had once a conscience; Mr. Beecher, a man whose reckless, free-and-easy good nature, in spite of his singular unscrupulousness, suggests rather the idea of some oversight in the original construction of his moral machinery, whereby the very place in the soul to put a conscience in was somehow left out. Mr. John Stuart Mill believes his crotchety theories with all that intensity which marks the God-rejecting intellect "given over to strong delusion to believe a lie"; Mr. Beecher never really believed anything in his life, never having cared to inquire what is true or false, but only what will the public think it smart and original for Beecher to say.

It is surely a fact worthy of some thoughtful consideration, that two such men, about the same date, one in monarchical Great Britain, the other in the Democratic United States; the one before a Parliament of burly British men, the other before a congress of strong-minded Yankee women—should be found urging a proposition so radically subversive of both British and American civilization, as the right and duty of women to vote in political affairs, and of course to be voted for as legislators, judges, and Presidents; and of course, also, as incidental to "bearing the sword" of civil rule, to perform military service.

What, then, is the explanation of this singular junction of these two representative men—of the metaphysician and the clap-trap demagogue, the earnest, "serious atheist," as Francis William Newman would call him, and the unearnest, comical gospel minister, in the advocacy of this insane movement? We

soberly believe we can give the explanation, and we would ask for it the very solemn consideration of that large class of Protestant Christians of the Gallic school, who have sneered at such as we for years past as mere ecclesiastical pugilists; and of that class of amiable, trouble-hating men in the Church, who have been permitting themselves to be led by the nose for years past by their more determined and self-reliant Jacobin co-officials in the Church; and of that class of good-natured, silly shepherds who have covenanted with the wolves, for the sake of peace and quiet, to kill the watch dogs.

Very plainly this unity of sentiment and action between the British Atheistic radical party and the American Christian radical party, must arise from agreement in some common error lying back of all the diversities that apparently put them into antagonism. That common error is precisely the error out of which grows all this folly concerning "manhood suffrage," and its two corollaries—negro suffrage and woman suffrage. For the three are inseparably connected, the last two flowing from the first, as any logical thinker must see. Nor is it within the limits of logical possibility for a man to accept those theories of manhood suffrage which not only a political party but church circles have recently enunciated, in their cowardly eagerness to degrade and vilify the civilization of the prostrate South, and then reject with any consistency the theory of woman suffrage. This even Mr. Beecher is logician enough to perceive, and, already, to taunt his less radical negro-equality co-laborers with their stupidity in not seeing and accepting.

The common error of the Atheistic and of the professedly Christian Jacobins is to be found in their conception of the original constituent elements of the State as consisting of individual human beings and not—according to God's great ordinances—of the families, which God has already organized anterior to any humanly devised State organizations. Upon the full recognition of this great ordinance of God, as its fundamental principle, has the Anglo-Saxon civilization heretofore rested; and because of resting thus upon this great principle of the family as *jure divino*, and not a human organization, but anterior to all human organizations, has that civilization been so stable, as compared with the other civilizations of Europe. It is out of this principle that grows the British maxim of "every man's house his castle"; the British theory of the inalienability of *femme covert*, as of the minor to make contracts; since as God has declared "they twain are one flesh," the British reverence for the marriage tie is indissoluble; save for two causes which subvert its end; and the British idea of home-holder suffrage as the basis of a representative government. Whatever exceptions, modifications, perversions, or departures from principle may be shown, the fundamental political theory of the Anglo-Saxon civilization is that the first organized government is God's organization of the family; the State is the organization of federated families; and every man who has a voice in the government of the State should represent a family either *in esse* or *in posse*. Hence the now popular cant of "manhood suffrage" and its corollary of "womanhood suffrage," or as Mr. Beecher's glittering generality puts it—"suffrage the inherent right of mankind," is simply a renunciation of the Anglo-Saxon civilization by the renunciation of its fundamental truth; and at the same time a renunciation of the revealed truth of God concerning the constitution of human society.

Mr. John Stuart Mill, of course cares nothing about how God organized society if his metaphysical machinery—working after the fashion of the steam spinners and weavers which he so fitly represents in Parliament—weaves out a different social fabric. As he informs the world, in his criticisms of Sir William Hamilton, that, when sent to hell, he intends still to stick to his opinion, as against God's, concerning what is just and true, he of course cares little for God's opinion as against his own, concerning how society is constituted in the present world. We are not the least surprised, therefore, to find him in the British Parliament advancing from his Jacobinical-Chartist premises of the "inherent right of suffrage," and "manhood suffrage" to the conclusion of "womanhood suffrage" also. Nor are we greatly surprised either to be told that in the British Parliament there are now found seventy-two of the Hon. Titled and Titmouse order of statesmen to endorse Mr. John Stuart Mill's opinion.

But at first sight it is a little surprising to find a Christian minister, the popular leader of the "advanced thought" of the progressive Protestant Christianity of the Northern United States; with the New England Independent bodies, Pedobaptist and Ana-Baptist almost abreast, and the Methodist Conferences East and West just at his heels, and Presbyterian Synods and General Assemblies of every variety trudging more slowly along in the wake, and a large segment of Episcopacy moving on but not keeping up,

simply because of its entanglements with a semi-Popish High-churchism—we say it is at first sight a little surprising, to find this man and his tail actively co-laboring with the Atheistic John Stuart Mill upon a platform which is utterly subversive both of our religion and our civilization.

Yet to any one who has studied the progress of things in our country for the past quarter of a century; who has watched the outworkings of the political Jacobinism introduced, expounded and propagated by Horace Greeley, the American John Stuart Mill, under the guise of the organization and protection of labor against capital; the contemporaneous rise and progress of the religious negro-philanthropy in the Northern Churches; the final alliance between the Jacobin, free-labor, Anti-slaveryism of Greeley and the religious anti-slaveryism, for the overthrow of our social and political constitutions—to such an one it ceases to be a marvel that the Mill-Greeley Atheism has at length utterly subverted the faith of their Christian allies. No wonder that Beecher and Greeley should be occupying the same religious platform, though Greeley has stood fast to his infidel creed, to make the mountain come to Mahomet. The story is too long to be appended here, we will relate and expound it in a future essay.

The latest "Black Crook" sensation.
"Let him that is without sin amongst you cast the first stone."

Our city gossips have been deeply exercised all the week, over the report in the secular papers that two clergymen (we know not who, nor care to know), one from the city, the other from the country, disguised themselves and went to the theater with the crowd, to see the "Black Crook" performed, and were there arrested by the police as suspicious characters, and thus exposed.

We will not, of course, be understood to be the advocates and apologists of the clergymen, if they were such, who thus "followed the multitude to do evil," contrary to the special warning of the Word of God, which it is their specific function to expound to the people. Nor have we a word to say in the way of objection to the enforcing of the most rigid ecclesiastical discipline against men who, pretending to teach and to represent the gospel of Jesus Christ, which forbids all conformity to the world's fashions and spirit, should these ministers belong to any denunciation of Christians which enjoins non-conformity to the world, alike upon its ministers and private members.

But we have several things to say in the way of denunciation to the swift sentence of the outside world, summarily condemning these so-called ministers of the gospel. In the first place, the principle suggested by our Saviour is, that those who set themselves up as judges to pronounce sentence should be very careful first to see that their own lives are free from all taint of impurity. He does not allow those who themselves are first to indulge their worldly passions and tastes to "cast the first stone" at their fellow-criminals—that is, to assume the position of censors and judges, and to practice that cheap sort of virtue which atones for one's own delinquencies by the sharpness of one's insight in detecting the sins of other people. Whether, therefore, these detected ministers were right or wrong in visiting the theater to witness an obscene play, is surely not a question to be determined against them by those who themselves were in the act of indulging their purient tastes when they discovered these ministers of the gospel stealing into their licentious communion. We are not yet prepared to admit a monopoly of licentiousness. If it is a legitimate indulgence of their tastes for fashionable gentleman and ladies to witness, in the presence of each other, the performance of semi-nude dancing girls, arrayed, as Thomas Carlyle describes it, "in muslin saucers," we do not understand why they should be so swift to judge a couple of ministers who happened to have a passion for partaking in their very genteel and fashionable enjoyments, as they deem them.

For, in the second place, we utterly eschew the theory that the gospel ministry of our times is to be a John Baptist ministry, "neither eating nor drinking," but taking religion off into the wilderness, out of the way of the fashionable, worldly people. It is rather a ministry of the "Son of man, who came eating and drinking," mingling with the people socially and unreservedly. There is no provision made in this system for a ministry which shall stand as proxies for a self-indulgent people, and, in consideration of a pittance of power, punctually or unpunctually paid, perform all the self-denials, all the renunciations of "the pomps and vanities of the world," all the fighting against "the world, the flesh, and the devil," for the people. Whatever it is proper for any pure-minded Christian man to do, it is proper for a minister to do; and whatever it is competent to any pure-minded gentleman and lady to do, who expects to go to heaven, as all do, it is competent for a Christian man and

woman to do. There is no such thing as one ethical law of God for people in the Church, and another more accommodating law of God for people out of the Church. If people in the Church, therefore, do only the same thing and indulge themselves to the same extent that others outside of the Church do, whatever sin they may have to answer for before God, it illy becomes those who are guilty of the same indulgences to become their accusers and judges. The most that can be said about it is that church-members have failed to discharge an obligation after honestly giving bond to perform it, while others fail to discharge obligations, equally strong, which they have dishonestly refused to give their bond to discharge.

If, therefore, it is very wicked for these Christian ministers to go and witness the obscenities of the "Black Crook," or any other of the devil's black arts at the theater, it is equally wicked for any Christian man and woman to do so. The only peculiarity of the ministers' wickedness is that it is in regard of a certain official obligation, which sides being done in disregard of the ordinary solemn obligation of every other Christian people. And if it is very wicked for any Christian man and woman to do such things, contrary to solemn obligations honestly acknowledged, it is no less wicked for men and women outside the Church to do the same things contrary to obligations which they dishonestly refuse to acknowledge. It is simply the difference between a failure in one instance to pay a just debt by a man who usually pays his honest debts, and the failure, in a like single instance, to pay a just debt by a man who has the dishonest habit of never paying his debts.

But, aside from the casuistry of the case, it is a rather singular instance of how slow people are to see their own wrong doings, and swift to see other people's, that men and women who thus ensure these ministers do not perceive that in so doing they admit the delinquency on their own part of indulging themselves in seeing and hearing what modesty and due regard for their morals, should forbid even a minister to see and hear, who is supposed to have even more self-restraint than ordinary people. Is it not rather odd to hear of men of culture, who are esteemed as ranking high above the sensuous and sensual masses, going to places where it is a shocking thing for their minister to bear them company? Especially is it not a little odd to be told of places where modest, refined, and elegant ladies may resort without offense to delicacy or danger to their morals, and yet these places unfit to be visited by a strong, full-grown man, if he happen to be a minister of religion?

As we have said, we make no apology for these foolish ministers. All we mean to say is, that fashionable Christians and the genteel outsiders, who themselves have indulged their curiosity, if not some baser passion, in going to witness this devil's trick of "model artists," veiled with tattered theatrical fig-leaf, are certainly not the parties to "cast the first stone" at the detected preachers.

Some of the Points in which the Carley Facto Order was Unconstitutional.

The order excluding the signers of the Declaration and Testimony and the members of the Louisville Presbytery who voted to adopt it from the courts higher than the church session, was palpably unconstitutional, and therefore "null and void," for the following, among other reasons:

I. The condemnation "of the Declaration and Testimony as a slander against the church, schismatical in its character and aims," in the nature of the case was a condemnation of the signers thereof as slanderers and schismatics. This is in its nature a judicial sentence. And yet this sentence was pronounced not only without form of trial, but without hearing. So far as the Assembly was concerned, it could have no knowledge of the Declaration and Testimony except as garbled and misrepresented in an *ex parte* report, which, instead of acting upon the Assembly "referred to the next Assembly," (min. 1866, p. 61) all of which is in violation of the provisions of the constitution for trial before sentence, and especially in violation of Discipline, chap. 5, sec. 1—"Neither ought scandalous charges to be received against him (a minister) on slight ground"—and indeed of all the provisions for fair trial laid down in that chapter.

II. The order excluding signers of the Declaration and Testimony from "any church court higher than the Session," on penalty of the *ipso facto* dissolution of such Presbytery, is in its nature, absurd as implying that to sit in such courts is a privilege conferred, rather than a duty inherently belonging to the minister's office, as much so as preaching and the pastoral work. There is no such penalty contemplated in the constitution as a suspension from the half or any other fraction of ministerial functions. If these signers continue to be ministers in good standing, then they cannot be excluded from Presbyteries

by anything short of suspension from the ministry. For the constitution declares (Form of Gov. chap. x, 2d sec.) "A Presbytery consists of all the ministers and one ruling elder from each congregation within a certain district." So of the Synod, (chap. XI, sec. 1.) There is no such thing known in the Presbyterian system as a minister, especially an acting pastor who has no right to sit in the Presbytery.

If, on the other hand, these signers are not ministers in good standing, then certainly it contravenes the whole spirit and teaching of the Constitution of the word of God to permit such men to continue in the pastoral work, teaching and ruling over the congregation in the Church Session.

Neither, again, has the General Assembly a right to deprive a congregation of its representation, through its pastor in Presbytery and Synod, especially so long as the pastor is recognized as competent to teach and rule over the congregation. And so it might be shown how other absurdities and incongruities follow from the supposition that the General Assembly may inflict such a sentence under the Constitution. The very conception of such a penalty could have occurred only to a mind either palpably ignorant of, or palpably ignoring the first principles of Presbyterianism.

III. The summoning of the signers of the Declaration and Testimony to "appear before the next General Assembly, to answer for what they have done, without other citations, and with no provision for bringing charges against them—may, after one Assembly has already charged and condemned them as slanderers and schismatics (see Resolutions I and III, min. of 1866, pp. 60 and 61)—is manifestly a violation of these constitutional provisions:

(1.) That process against a minister shall always be entered before his Presbytery. (Discipline, chap. V, sec. 11.)

(2.) That when Presbytery or Synod fails in duty in this regard, and the superior court must proceed on common fame, it shall proceed as if the case were brought up by review. (Discipline, chap. VII, sec. 1st, paragraph 5th.)

(3.) That in such case, the first step is to cite the judicatories alleged to have offended. (Discipline, chap. VII, sec. 1st, paragraph 6th.)

(4.) That there are but four ways, viz: by reference, by appeal or complaint, by review or control, in which the case of the signers of the Declaration and Testimony could come before the Assembly—in neither of which was it before the Assembly, when it gave this judgment. (Discipline, chap. VII.) That the reason assigned by the Assembly for this extraordinary course—viz: (Min. of '66, section 3), "that the Assembly is the only body, in the present circumstances of the Church, which can properly and without embarrassment adjudicate the case"—is manifestly false, appears from page 48 of the Minutes of '66. For it there appears that at this very time the Assembly had before it in the regular way provided for in the Constitution, by the appeals of R. J. Breckinridge and McMillan, the whole subject of the Declaration and Testimony and the conduct of Louisville Presbytery; and that it refused to try and issue the appeals, but referred them to the next Assembly, only to be refused a hearing there, on the ground that the action under this *ipso facto* order left no place for the trial and issue of the appeals.

IV. The penalty of the *ipso facto* dissolution of the Presbyteries, which may permit signers of the Declaration and Testimony to sit in them, is a penalty unknown to the Constitution, absurd in its nature, and founded upon utter misconception of the ministerial office, as though it were an office that a man may be half way deposed from. These ministers and elders of the dissolved Presbytery must be regarded either as deposed from the sacred office or not deposed. If deposed, then they have become so by mere resolution, without even a hearing, much less trial according to the Constitution. If they are not deposed, but still are ministers, then it is inherent in their office as pastors to be members of Presbytery and Synod; and the effect of this *ipso facto* decree is thus to create a nondescript class of ecclesiastical persons, wholly unknown to the Constitution. And it may be added that this *ipso facto* decree is in its nature and operation strikingly analogous at least to that of the ancient "bill of attainder" in civil law; a principle which even the Constitution of the United States has forbidden to be recognized in civil law on the score of the dangers arising from it to the civil rights of man; much less can such a principle be in accordance with the holy law given by Christ to His Church.

V. But anterior to all considerations of this sort—which many more equally forcible might be offered—as proving the utter unconstitutionality of the Assembly's decree against Louisville Presbytery and the signers of the Declaration and Testimony, the whole proceedings are seen to be unconstitutional from the fact that the Declaration and Testimony is itself but a simple assertion of the Constitution against the unlawful decrees of Assembly from 1861 to 1865. It is simply an earnest protest against certain acts of Assembly, citing the acts and principles protested against, and exposing their unconstitutionality. In declaring their purpose not to execute the orders of 1865, the signers of that paper did only what their obligations as office-bearers, sworn to support the Constitution, made it incumbent on them to do—only what they had abundant precedents in the history of the Presbyterian Church, down to the "Act and Testimony" of 1835, for doing; and only what the interests of religion, and especially of the Presbyterian Church in their more immediate section, required them to do. A calm and dispassionate examination and comparison of the Declaration and Testimony with the acts of Assembly against which it protests, will make it

manifest that the signers of that protest were earnest in their zeal for the Constitution and the Church, and that their "zeal was not without knowledge." Thus the whole proceeding against the signers of that paper and against the Louisville Presbytery, was, in its general purpose and aim, unconstitutional, as well as in the details of procedure at every step, as shown above; and therefore is void of all obligation upon the Presbytery, and individual ministers alike.

Errata in our last issue.

We feel it due to ourselves to remind our readers, once for all, that we have seldom either time or opportunity to read the proofs of our editorials, and therefore sometimes find the types badly misrepresenting us. Generally, we have had the patience to bear with these errors of the press, but our last issue makes patience cease to be a virtue. After all the endeavors of our publishers to get worked into decent sense, one of the meanest proofs we have ever seen, still errors destroying the sense, or making us utter nonsense, disfigure almost every column on the second page. Thus we are made to say in column first, "a pretty contribution of \$10,000," for "a pretty contribution of \$10,000," &c. In column second, "really cross-grained," for "very cross-grained." In third column, "only contemplative," for "self-contemplative." In column fourth, "assaulting" Mr. B.'s congregation, for "insulting" Mr. B.'s congregation. In column fifth, "their" celestial cant, as though we referred to Mr. B. and his people, instead of "the" celestial cant, referring to the allies of their persecutors generally. So, again, "our secession cotemporary the Statesman," for "our secular cotemporary"; and again, "the peaceful slumbers of your square," instead of "slumbers of your square." In column sixth, "striking" for "strife-hating." These are some of the errata, more important to the sense, and are noted because some of them make us seem to do injustice to others.

A Trip to Nashville Meeting of Synod.
NASHVILLE, Tenn., Sep. 30 1867.

MESSRS. EDITORS:—It was my good fortune last week to visit this city, for the first time, and look in upon the Synod of Nashville then in session. It was a smaller body than I expected to find, composed as it is of four Presbyteries. Many of the ministers were absent, especially from North Alabama Presbytery, and comparatively few of the churches were represented at all. Doubtless many of the ministers and elders had a good excuse for their non-attendance; but it does not look encouraging for Presbyterianism in that region, to find less than one half of the ministers in attendance and not one tenth of the churches represented. The poverty of the people has driven many of the ministers to engage in secular employments, in order to provide food and raiment for their families, which may have prevented their attendance upon Synod; but this I trust will only be temporary.

The ministers, at least those who were present at this meeting, are mostly young men—full of energy and zeal in the pulpit, but not familiar or expert in ecclesiastical matters. Complaints are sometimes made that one or two men control our ecclesiastical bodies. But it is a question in my mind, whether it is not better that one or two good ecclesiasticians should so control matters in our Church Courts, and give shape to the questions before the body, than that all should feel called upon to speak upon these questions, without presenting any well defined ideas of how certain ends may be accomplished. In the pulpit these young brethren felt at home, and preached the pure gospel with much earnestness and power. Many of them reported precious revivals in their congregations. The number reported as having been added on profession of faith during the year was over six hundred. This number did not include the Presbytery of North Alabama, there being no report from that Presbytery.

The city of Nashville is quite a pleasant city, containing as it does many fine residences. It has also many large and well stocked mercantile houses. But it is not the city of former days, as the best citizens confess with sadness; and I could well understand why they should so feel, after witnessing the thing called an "election" in Nashville. Nothing of a political character has so impressed me with the fact, that this fair land of ours is under the heel of despotism—cruel despotism, than this election which I witnessed on Saturday. The voters were negroes, chiefly, with a few of their Northern friends, and a handful of original secessionists, who are always looking out for the powerful side.

The First Presbyterian church has enjoyed a precious revival. The pastor, Dr. Bunting, has the confidence and affection of his people—and well he deserves both. He is indefatigable in his labors for their spiritual good. The Edgefield church, across the river, is at present supplied by Dr. Hoyt. The Second church is in connection with the Northern Assembly. After being allied with Rev. J. S. Hays, and then

with Rev. R. H. Allen, as pastors, it is not wonderful that it should be in that connection. It is now supplied by a young minister from the Presbytery of the Potomac. From some little matters which I learned, it is not all "peace and harmony," in that "loyal church." One party in the Church requested that the Synod supply the pulpit on yesterday, while another party in the church objected and the appointment was withdrawn.

I had frequently heard through our friend John McCallagh, Esq., the Sabbath school missionary, of the efficient Sabbath-school connected with the First Church, and was therefore prepared to find a large and well conducted school. But when I saw three hundred and twenty-five scholars, assembled in one room, and witnessed the good order maintained through all the exercises, I felt that the representation was by no means an exaggeration, and I could not but envy the tact which Mr. A. G. Adams, the superintendent, displayed in the management of such a school. I wish we had such superintendents in all our Sabbath schools. It was a relief to me by an earnest Christian lady, one of the teachers, that during the revival last winter, all the larger scholars but two were admitted by the session to the scaling ordinance of the Lords Supper.

The people of Nashville are looking forward with great interest to the meeting of the General Assembly, in November. The brethren will meet with a warm and cordial reception here; and although Nashville is not what it once was, the Christian people can never forget the art of entertaining the servants of their Lord and Master.

Did the Pope Excommunicate Luther, or Luther the Pope?—Bishop Green's Deposition of Rev. T. B. Maury.

We notice the following paragraph in the Southern secular papers:

"The Right Rev. Bishop Green has given notice by circular that he has deposed from the ministry John R. Maury, a presbyter of the diocese of Mississippi. Mr. Maury had declared to the Bishop his renunciation of the priesthood."

Precyane.
"He was recently in charge of the parish at Port Hudson, and had published and circulated a sermon in reply to a sermon delivered and published by his Bishop on the doctrine of the Apostolic Succession."

Now we happen to have a copy of Mr. Maury's letter to Bishop Green, relinquishing the ministry in the Episcopal Church. And we take the liberty of publishing it, just for the sake of the contrast between its spirit and the spirit of this lordly ecclesiastical papajany. Any man who can appreciate in the Christian earnestness and the value of brains in questions of theology and of the Church, after reading this letter and Mr. Maury's other letter, published last week, and his sermon on Apostolic Succession, will, we think, concur with us in judgment, that, practically, it is Rev. T. B. Maury who has deposed Bishop Green and his whole class of shamming, brainless ecclesiasticians—if not from their ecclesiastical functions as head "man-milliners," at least from any very high position in the esteem of earnest, thinking Christian men.

The Pope deposed Luther, but it must be remembered that Luther deposed the Pope also; and the verdict of the most enlightened public opinion has affirmed the validity of Luther's act rather than the Pope's.

[COPY.]
PORT GIBSON, MISS., July 1st, 1867.

The Right Rev. W. M. Green, D. D., Sewanee, Tenn.:

RIGHT REVEREND AND DEAR SIR: I write to inform you, canonically, that, after long and mature deliberation, I have determined to relinquish the Ministry in the Episcopal Church, in order, more efficiently, to discharge the duties of my Office, in connection with another Church.

I have no heart to go into an explanation of the step I now take. The Church I leave, is the Church of my fathers and forefathers for several generations; all my feelings and associations from boyhood to the present hour, cling to it; it contains my best-loved and most cherished friends and brethren; and, outside of it, I have scarcely an association or an acquaintance. My feelings and affection toward all within it who love our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity, and who preach the truth as it is in Jesus Christ and Him crucified, are unchanged and are unchangeable.

I am truly your obedient servant,
T. B. MAURY.

For the Free Christian Commonwealth.
Places of Meeting of the Synod of Kentucky.

The Synod's first meeting was held in 1802, and the places at which its regular annual meetings have been held, including the place of the next meeting, are as follows: Lexington 16, Danville 13, Louisville 6, Shelbyville and Frankfort each 4, Bardonia, Harrodsburg and Paris each 3, Hopkinsville, Henderson, Lebanon and Nashville, Tenn., each 2; while it has been held but once in each of the following places, viz: Springfield, Bowling Green, Mayville, Richmond, Russellville, Covington and Greensburg.

At a meeting of the Board of Trustees of Hanover College, at Madison, Ind., September 17, Rev. W. M. Blackburn of Treuton, N. J., was elected President.

[Continued from first page.]
so altogether extrinsic to each other as to leave without excuse the almost universal propensity to confound them together.

The world kingdom, or State, is manifestly, only, of Divine origin. It grows out of the social consciousness of man, and is framed and organized, by the natural intelligence of man, inspired by the pressure of his wants, necessities, and passions. But the spiritual kingdom, or Church, is immediately of Divine origin, and all its laws and agencies have been directly revealed from heaven.

The State is a natural institution, for the protection of man's interests, of life, liberty and property, during his temporary existence here. The Church is a supernatural institution, for the benefit of man's interests as an immortal creature here and hereafter.

The State, even as to its Divine authority, which lies back of its immediate authority from the will of the people, is from Christ Jesus as God the Creator, and contemplates man as simply man the creature. The Church, as to its Divine authority, is from Christ Jesus, God the Saviour, and contemplates man as man the sinner. The State has for its rule of action, primarily, the law of God the Saviour, as revealed directly and supernaturally by Him to the Church through the first four thousand years of his history.

The head of the State is the man Caesar—such ruler or rulers as the people may select and clothe with authority to represent and rule over them. The head of the Church is the Lord Jesus Christ, who calls, qualifies and commissions men to act in His name, upon the call of the people for the exercise of this authority among them.

The efficient power of the State is the power of the sword to enforce a compulsory obedience, and having special reference to the lawless as "a terror to evil doers." The efficient power of the Church is the power of the word to persuade men and to be the instrument through which the spirit "shall make them willing in the day of his power."

The subjects of the State are the masses of the families as citizens whom it aims to protect in their rights by restraining the lawless and wicked. The subjects of the Church are the "families that call on the name of the Lord," even God's elect, whom it seeks to train as citizens of an eternal kingdom.

The laws of the State are in their nature vindictive, for the suppression of wickedness by an appeal to fear; and their spirit is that of the judge and executioner avenging justice. The laws of the Church are in their nature disciplinary, a means of grace for the correction and spiritual restoration of the erring brother. A society educated only under the eye and up to the standard of the law of the State, which can take cognizance of overt acts, would be a community of knaves and sharpers and determined thieves. A society educated under and perfectly up to the law of the Church, appealing to the conscience and "reaching to the thoughts and intents of the heart," would be a society already in the enjoyment of millennial peace and love. Hence the blasphemous effrontery of the pretence to legislate by the State for the sympathies of a man's soul which rises independent of his bolts and bars as Gabriel of its violation of the great "act establishing religious freedom" which confines the jurisdiction of the magistrate to overt acts. In short, while the State is a society for the mutual protection of men, and their comfortable enjoyment of life, liberty and property in the present temporal estate, the Church is the society of the elect of God, the manifestation of the eternal purpose to redeem the mediatorial body of Christ, and a means of calling, training and edifying the willing subjects of redeeming grace.

It would appear therefore that, while both the kingdoms are of God one immediately, the other indirectly; while both have to do with men—the same men it may be—the subjects of their government; and while both have as an ultimate end the glory of God; yet these two kingdoms are so extrinsic to each other in their nature and functions, and have really so little relation to each other when intelligently comprehended, that the difficulty really is to see how they can have any relation of mutual connection, rather than how to prevent a confounding of the functions of the two. For being constituted for action in spheres radically different, they can no more discharge one the functions of the other, or one assist the other in the discharge of its offices, than the "recrepting" thing of the earth, or the fish adapted to move in the waters, can assist the fowls of the air in the discharge of their functions to fly.

Not only has the Church no commission to discharge the functions of the State, but the Church has no light in regard to the affairs of State—though she be a witness for the truth and a teacher—which the State already has not. The authority of the Church being spiritual, and resting wholly upon moral suasion to secure voluntary obedience, has no adaptation to the sphere of the State as a government of force, and cannot possibly be of use except remotely and indirectly. And even though undertaken only indirectly to manage or assist in managing the affairs of the State, the Church at once loses her power to secure obedience to her own authority, and thus fails to accomplish either her own spiritual ends or the secular ends of the State. Nor can the State any more have a commission to discharge the functions of the Church or to assist the Church in the discharge of her functions; nor has it the ability so to do, even independent of the question of the commission to do so. For what if it be a Christian State, as men would call it, having the light of revelation? Yet the State has not, as such, that illumination of the Holy Spirit which alone can rightly interpret the gospel. That gos-

pel Jesus declares is "hid from the wise and prudent and revealed unto babes." The unconverted statesman, even with the truths of the Bible accepted intellectually, is not thereby any the more enlightened for the Church than he is as a worldly man, hardened by the process of perceiving the truth and yet searing the conscience against it, is not the man to be, in his official character as statesman, a "nursing father" to the Church. That Atheists, Deists, despisers, haters, and determined antagonists of the truth as it is in Jesus, are the peculiar product of Christian lands. The only form of Christianity that such men will, as statesmen, be disposed to patronize is the gospel of Formalism, Rationalism, or Latitudinarianism; those who object to walk in gospel ways, while the true apostles weep over them as "enemies of the Cross of Christ."

And aside from considerations of this sort, the authority which the State exercises, and its agencies for accomplishing its purposes are, as has been shown, utterly repugnant to the nature of the Church's agencies and work, being a power of compulsion and not a power of moral suasion. It cannot therefore really aid the Church in the discharge of her functions any more than the terrapin could aid the hawk in flying.

Such are the inferences we draw as to the origin, nature, and the functions of the Church and State respectively, from Christ's summary declaration of them. And if we examine now the spiritual history of the Church, under any and every dispensation, we shall find these inferences substantiated by the historic teachings of the word as to the relations of the Church to the State.

[Remainder next week.]

Good Sense of the Freeman's Journal.
We commend the following very sensible remarks of a Roman Catholic journal to the special attention of a certain class of Christian or semi-Christian people, who deem it an evidence of their praiseworthy liberality of feeling to turn over the education of their daughters to Roman Catholic teachers.

We happen to know incidentally something of the facts concerning the location of Mr. Davis's children at school, from having met his family at the Falls in the summer of '65. The children were placed in school at Montreal merely as a temporary arrangement, and rather against the wishes of their excellent grandmother—an earnest, thorough-going, evangelical, Episcopal lady, who, as Mr. McMaster rightly supposes, entertains the good old-fashioned notions of the education of children.

But our object was simply to call attention to the very sensible and suggestive remarks of the *Freeman's Journal*:
MR. JEFFERSON DAVIS'S FAMILY AFFAIRS.

A gossip of the *New York Herald*, some time ago, had a paragraph about how some young Canadian girl had said she had been the school mate of the daughter of Mr. Davis in Montreal, and how Mr. Davis had taken his daughter, of very tender years, away for fear she would become a Catholic. The idle babble of these daily papers is not at all to be taken seriously, but the *Catholic Telegraph*, at Cincinnati, comments on the fable, and suggests that there was a show of bigotry in Mr. Davis doing as he was, falsely, charged. On this we take issue. Mr. Davis is reported to be a member of the Protestant Episcopal Church, to be such a man that he would not be so much as to be bound to bring up, in it, his children. There would be no "bigotry," only conscientiousness, in the case. Mr. Davis would have acted in a manner perfectly correct, on such a supposition of his sentiments, in sending his children to a school where he was likely to imbibe a belief her father did not approve.

Just reverse the picture. Suppose some Protestant Academy had given kindly shelter, for a time, to a daughter of Beauregard's, or of the gallant General Beauregard's, and the latter had survived the war. What Catholic would doubt the course the father should take in either of these cases, especially were there any danger of a daughter—a mere child—being turned from the religion of her parents by the influences of a boarding-school.

But, as it happens, and as we know from year family connections of Mr. Davis, there is not one word of truth in the story. Mr. Davis, however, entertains some of our own old-fashioned notions. He believes in children—especially girls—being brought up in the faith of their fathers, to—when there are circumstances that permit this home education. More than a year ago, some of Mr. Davis's family connections established a family home in Montreal. He, by an unimpeachable outburst, was still a prisoner of State, under order of Andrew Johnson.

But so soon as there was a home, even temporary, for his children to resort to, it was the natural impulse of the heart of the illustrious prisoner that his children should not be left to the care of strangers, however kind or good. Prison-life intensifies the regard for home, in noble natures. The infant daughter of Mr. Davis was, therefore, more than a year ago, taken to her grandmother's house, as her natural home, while her illustrious father was in the prison of his political persecutors. There was no question at all about her religion. Her infancy was too inchoate to admit such a suggestion. The good ladies of the Sacred Heart, near Montreal, were sincerely thankful for her loving care, and the little one, in a moment of terrible misfortune. But the natural place for such a little one was with her own family. It was cruel to wound the affections of the heart by newspaper paragraphs.

And cannot the distinguished exile for his loving care, and the little one, in a moment of terrible misfortune. But the natural place for such a little one was with her own family. It was cruel to wound the affections of the heart by newspaper paragraphs.

Rev. S. J. P. Anderson, of St. Louis, Mo., who has been in Virginia some weeks for his health, writes from the Healing Springs. He has just completed a month at these unrivaled Springs, and with a grateful heart record that their efficacy has been most wonderful—making me feel as if I had a new lease of life, and causing me to long to buckle on the armor of a new campaign in the service of Him who is dealing so mercifully with me. Indeed, it is difficult to see how any one would fail to improve here."

Happy and not happy.
These words were spoken by a young man, about a month before he died of consumption.

I found him sitting near the fire, and I asked him, had he peace in his soul through faith in the Lord Jesus.

He gave me no answer.
I spoke to him for some time, in a general way, about the great love which God has manifested in giving His only Son to die for us, that we might not perish, but have everlasting life. He listened very attentively, and I asked him, was he a believer in Jesus the Son of God?

No answer.
I continued my conversation, dwelling on the finished work of Jesus on Calvary, and asked him the third time, Are you happy?

"I am happy, and I am not happy," he said despondingly; "but, alas! it is not the right sort of happiness."

"I have been one of the most wicked-living young men in Liverpool. I have endeavored to make as many infidels and blasphemers as I could, although I always knew that there is a God, a just God. I believe the Bible to be true, though in public I said it was a lie; and, in the face of a condemning conscience, I labored to make people blaspheme the name of Jesus."

"And what do you mean when you say you are happy?" I asked.

"I mean this, that as I lived for the devil and served him here, I am going to be with him now! for I know I am dying, and it is perfectly just in God to send me to hell forever. He not only gave me warnings from His word, but he gave me two warnings by sickness. In each I promised that if He lifted me up I would renounce my evil ways, and serve Him; but I only became worse than ever I had been before. This is the third and last time. God is taking me away now, and I am going to hell! I am lost!"

"Ah!" he said, with much emotion and emphasis, "I know there is a just God, and a hell for those who disobey Him. I knew it all my life, and they all know it, though they deny it as I did" (meaning his infidel companions). "You said that you were lost."

"Yes," he said, "and I believe it."

"But you look only on the dark side, when, blessed be God, there is a bright side too."

"That holy God, against whom you have rebelled all your life, so loved you, that He sent His only-begotten Son to die on the cross, that He might not perish, but have everlasting life. (John iii. 16.) Jesus left the bosom of His Father in glory, stripped Himself of his robes of majesty, laid by his regal crown, took upon him the form of a servant, humbled Himself even to suffer the shameful, ignominious death of the Cross. For whom did He do this? For lost, condemned sinners."

"Thou art lost and condemned; therefore He did it for thee; for He came to seek and to save the lost. (Luke xix. 10.) He came to seek and to save you. He is speaking to you to-day. Are you willing to be saved by Him? He is willing, if you are. He is able to save even to the uttermost, the vilest sinner under heaven, who comes to Him and believes the precious news which He proclaims to sinners."

"His blood can make the foulest clean, His blood can save the soul of man."

"He came not to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance."

"When can a poor condemned culprit best learn the love and compassion of his sovereign? Is it not when the officer is reading the reprieve at the cell door, when he reads the full and free pardon for all his transgressions?"

"Yes," he replied.
"Well, here I am, one of his Majesty's servants, reading the reprieve for you; a full and free pardon for all your sins, though they be many, and aggravating to God. (Isa. i. 18.) If you believe it and receive the Lord Jesus Christ as your Lord and Saviour, you will be free, you will be saved. (1 Tim. ii. 15.)"

"It is not for all your past transgressions that you will be damned. It is for the rejection of Jesus as your Saviour and Substitute, as the One who bore your condemnation in his own body on the tree. It is for rejecting the good news, the reprieve which He now offers you."

"When the Lord Jesus hung upon the cross, with his dying breath, He said, 'It is finished.' The work of salvation completed. He that believes for himself shall be saved, and shall not come into condemnation, but is passed from death unto life."

"When I was leaving him he said: 'What you have said to me seems to cast a ray of hope into my soul.'"

I called two days afterwards, and asked him, "Have you been thinking of those sweet and precious words of Jesus, 'It is finished'?"

"Yes," he said; "I have scarcely thought of anything else since you were here."

I dwelt more fully on the same words, and said: "Suppose you owed a debt, and the sentence of the court was, 'Cast him into prison till he pays it.' You had no means to pay it. But a friend comes in and offers to pay it for you. Now, if you believe your friend, and accept his offer, you would have joy and peace in your mind; because you would know that there was no prison for you, no condemnation for you."

So it is in regard to the eternal debt you owe. Jesus, the great friend of sinners, comes in to you to-day and says, 'It is finished.' I have borne your sentence and condemnation in my body on the Cross. He that believes in Me shall be saved."

"God raised Him from the dead, to show that the work was once and forever finished."

"If you believe this good news now, and look to Jesus for pardon, you will be saved. Then there will be no prison—no hell—no condemnation for you! but, believing in Jesus Christ, heaven will be your home, Jesus your Saviour and friend, and God your Father!"

"Your authority for believing this is the word of Jesus. Jesus says it, you

believe it, and you are happy."
He looked up to me with such a meaning, happy countenance, that I shall never forget, and said, "Oh, my God! hast Thou loved me thus, who cursed thy blessed name so often? Yes, Thou hast. I see it now. I do believe it. I am saved. I am happy."

This unexpected declaration caused his wife to weep audibly.
He looked at her and said, "Weep not for me now; but rather rejoice; I cannot weep except for joy, for I would not for a thousand worlds be left here. I am going to Jesus, which is far better—He who loved me, and gave Himself for me."

A few days after I asked him, "Do you find Satan tempting you to doubt your safety and security in Jesus?"
"No," he replied; "I feel strong in faith, so much so that if all the devils in hell were in my room, I could laugh at them, and tell them to do their worst."

"Why are you able to say that?"
"Well," he said, "because Jesus says to every one who believes in Him, 'I will never leave thee nor forsake thee,' and He has power over the whole of heaven. He is my Saviour, and I am His."

And thus he passed away, a noble conqueror, hearing from earth's dark battle-field the palm of victory and crown of glory, all through Jesus, who loved him, and gave Himself for him.

Dear reader, are you unsaved? This is all for you. Are you a great sinner? Like this poor man, you may receive a full and free forgiveness through the blood of Jesus. Oh, fly to Him, and then you will be safe indeed.

P. J. G.

For the Children.

The Heathen Mother.

"Thy Kingdom come."
"Next Sabbath is missionary day." So spoke Mr. Monroe to a class of boys before him. "I hope you will not forget to bring something, but come prepared to do whatever you are able, only let it be your own money, and no one else's."

"What do you mean, Mr. Monroe?" asked one of the boys. "We would not give what does not belong to us."

"No, Walter; I should be very sorry indeed to think any of my boys would do that. I mean simply this: if you give, let it be of your own money. Do not go to your parents and ask them for it."

"I always do that, Mr. Monroe," said Louis Harvey.

"Then, Louis, you never really give anything."

"Why, Mr. Monroe, father is always willing to give it to me, and has done ever since I was a little boy. I don't see but that that does as much good as if I took my own money, and I want that for other things."

"I did not mean to say, Louis, that the money of your father's that you sent would not work the same for the heathen as if you sent your own, although I have my doubts as to whether God would bless what was given in that way as much as if there had been self-denial in the giving; but apart from that, it does not do the same good to yourselves."

"I do not see that it does us any good anyhow."

"No, of course not, if every time a collection is taken up you simply ask your father for the money and drop it into the box. If you were willing to deny yourself a little, I think you would soon begin to be more interested in the heathen, and you would wish to know the result of your self-denial."

"I never think about what becomes of the money, the heathen seem so very far off."

"Yes I suppose so; but they would not, if you knew more of their condition, and really desired the hastening of the day when God's kingdom should come over all the earth."

The bell rang, and the teacher was stopped from further conversation with his pupils. He went from them that day with the inward prayer that they might first be led to the Saviour themselves, and then taught to long for the coming of his kingdom in less favored lands.

The week passed by, and with the Sabbath the boys were again collected, together with their teacher. As he held out his hand to receive the money which each had brought, he looked in to his eyes to see if he had followed his advice and been mindful of his wishes. Each looked down, sensible that he had not acted according to his teacher's desires until he came to the last two.

"I have none to-day, Mr. Monroe."

"None, Walter? I am sorry for that."

"So am I, and I did not intend it should be so. I had some of my own that I had been keeping all the week to bring—"

He hesitated, and Mr. Monroe said,

"And you forgot it this morning?"

"No, sir, I did not forget it; but yesterday, as I was passing a store, I saw something that I wanted very much. I thought over it a long time, and at last I concluded that I would buy it, and get the money from father once more. Next month I would certainly save some of my own."

"Why did you not get it from your father, as you had determined?"

"I was thinking it over last night, and concluded it would be showing more respect for you to come without it, than to bring some of father's, after you had said as much as you did against our doing so."

"You are right, Walter. I thank you that you had so much regard for my wishes. Next month I hope you will not be too strongly tempted."

"I hope not, I am sure."

Next came Louis Harvey. He looked up with a smile as he placed in Mr. Monroe's hand a bright silver quarter.

"I am glad that two among you have profited by last Sabbath's lesson, one in the intention to do right, the other in carrying that intention into practice. And more than usual, too, Louis. How is that?" Louis looked down, and said, softly,

"You said, Mr. Monroe, when once

we wished God's kingdom to come, we would be interested in the heathen, and be willing to give our own money to send Bibles and missionaries to them. I have learned the truth of what you said this week."

"What has made you feel so, Louis? May I ask?"

"There was a missionary from India who came to see father last Wednesday night, and told us some things that made me feel how badly off they were in that land, and how much in need of the Bible. I wish I might do more for them. I will try this month to see if I cannot save more for our next collection."

"I wish we could hear the missionary too," said one.

"Can't Louis tell us all that he said, Mr. Monroe?" asked Walter.

"Yes, if he pleases; I should be glad to hear him too. What do you think about it, Louis?"

"I think perhaps I can tell the story which most interested me. It is like what has often been told before, but somehow what you said last Sabbath made me think more about it, and then this gentleman was a friend of the woman's, and that brought it nearer home. It seemed more like truth."

The substance of the story was the following:

There was a young woman, who, with her husband, lived very happily in the northern part of India. They had one child, a baby not quite a year old. It was of an age to make itself particularly dear to its parents, and they watched with joy its laugh of recognition when they came near it, and its many other baby ways to attract notice to itself. At length, over the happiness of their home there fell a shadow. Sickness visited the husband in a severe form, and all efforts to heal him seemed of no avail. His wife came to him one morning, saying she had found a remedy.

The cause of his long sickness was known, and it should soon be removed. Her face bore strong evidence of weeping, and her manner betrayed great agitation. In alarm he inquired of her the cause. She replied that the god of the river Ganges was angry that they had so long withheld their offering, their only one, from him, and his anger would not be appeased until they had offered the sacrifice. The priest had told her this.

Her husband started as if from the shock of a thunderbolt, and tried to believe it otherwise; but the authority was too high to be denied. The demands of their god must be respected. For the next few days they watched with tearful eyes their babe, and held it fondly to their bosoms, as if naught could tear it away. At length the end came, the day that had been fixed upon, and she was to take the babe and offer it up to the river Ganges. She arose early in the morning, without her husband's knowledge, dreading the parting from him, and fearing lest he might detain her and her own weak resolution give way. She had to walk many miles to accomplish her object, with the heavy load about her heart almost bearing her to the earth. She arrived at the brink of the river, stood for a few moments looking into the face of the babe, as she pressed it more closely to her breast, kissed it for the last time, and then threw it into the river. An irresistible impulse held her there, and she saw her child stretch out its hands as if in mute supplication for help; then it sank beneath the water, never to rise again.

With a broken heart she returned to her now desolate home. Life had lost its attraction to both father and mother, but still they lived on with this heavy sorrow upon their hearts. Time did not seem to soften their grief. The babe had so closely entwined itself around their hearts, that it could not thus rudely be torn from them without causing deep pain and agony. There was nothing to reconcile them to it; they only bowed to an irresistible fate. At length the missionary went to the place where they lived. He saw them amidst the crowd who had gathered together to celebrate one of their feasts. He noticed the sadness of their countenance, though they were surrounded by gaiety and festivity, and although he did not know the nature of their sorrow, he longed to pour into their bleeding hearts the balm of Christian consolation. He watched his opportunity for speaking with them; but when he asked the cause of their sorrow, expressing his hope of offering comfort, they shook their heads mournfully, as if that could never be their portion again. He, however, drew from them their story, and spoke to them some of the plainest of the Bible truths. By degrees their eyes were opened; the Holy Spirit removed their prejudices. In time the missionary had the happiness of administering to them the rite of Christian baptism in acknowledgment of their turning from their heathen gods, and of their faith in the one Jehovah. (One of the mother's first exclamations after the truth began to dawn in her mind, was, "Oh, sir, that you had come sooner, then I might have had my darling with me now! But I must not complain for now I have hope of seeing her in heaven, and then we shall never be parted.")

The story seemed to have had its effect on all their minds, and for a while the boys were all silent. Mr. Monroe was the first to speak.

"And so, Louis, this was what made you wish to do good to the heathen and send aid to them."

"Yes, sir; and his tones became too low for any but his teacher's ears; 'I knew how badly mother felt when little sister died, although she knew that God had taken her to himself, and I thought how terrible it must be for a mother to have to throw her only child into a river.'"

"I do not wonder at its effect. I only hope it may influence all the others in the same way. What do you think, boys? Will you be more willing to give your own money now, that such customs may be done away among them?"

"Yes, sir."

"I hope so."

"Indeed we will."

"In that case, this morning will not have been thrown away, although your regular lessons have been neglected. Let the remembrance, my dear pupils, of

God's goodness to you in placing you in this highly favored land and blessing you with Christian parents, lead you to give yourselves to Christ in these your youthful days. Ask him to reign in your own hearts, and then there will be far more earnestness in your prayer, 'Thy kingdom come.'"

C. P. BARNES'S EXTRA GOLD PENS

PRICE LIST.

PRICE LIST.		with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with Hobbs and Hobbs and Hobbs	with
-------------	--	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	------

Sent by mail, or express, on receipt of price. If by mail, include stamp for return postage. Old pens repaired, if sent by mail with 50 cents and stamp case.

Has gold and rings of any weight and quality made to order.

Complete stock of fine watches, jewelry, silver and plated ware, always on hand.

Watches and jewelry repaired and warranted by J. S. BARNES.

Ministers and Theological Students supplied with pens at half the above rates—and special reduction for other goods.

C. P. BARNES, No. 221 West Main Street, Louisville, Ky.

Feb. 23-ly.

MASON & SMITH, DEALERS IN COAL,

OFFICE—125 Third Street, East Side, Between Jefferson and Green.

Particular attention given to Orders by Railroad or Wagon.

Dec. 24, '65.

WM. L. CLARKE, Louisville, Ky.

J. S. LITGOW & CO., MANUFACTURERS OF

Stoves, Castings, & Hollowware, Moulds and Grates.

DEALERS IN Tinplate, Sheet Iron, Copper, and Tinners' Findings.

To Ministers of the Gospel.

RARE AND VALUABLE BOOKS.

OWEN'S WORKS, 16 vols. \$30.00
Calvin's Commentaries, 45 vols. 75.00
Letters, 3 vols. 5.00
Institutes, 1 vol. 4.00
Traill's Works, 2 vols., half calf. 7.00
Howe's Works, 3 vols. 7.50
McDonald on the Pentateuch, 2 vols. 10.00
Romaine's Works, 8 vols. 15.00
Lewith on Isaiah, 2 vols. 2.50
History of the 18th Century, by Schlozer, 8 vols. 15.00

Whitely on the New Testament, 2 vols. 10.00
Bible's Holy Writings, 4 vols. 4.00
Winans on the Covenant, 3 vols. 9.00
Edwards's Works, 2 vols., cloth. 12.00
Edwards's Works, 3 vols., sheep. 12.00
Treatise on Christian Doctrine, by John Milton, 2 vols., boards. 5.00
Clark's Commentary, 4 vols. 18.00
Henry's Commentary, 5 vols. 25.00
Tholuck's Romans, 2 vols. 2.00
Wood's Works, 5 vols. 12.00
McKnight on the Epistles, 4 vols. 4.00
Hengstenberg on the Epistles, 3 vols. 11.00
Hengstenberg on the Genuineness of Daniel's Prophecy, 1 vol. 5.00